関西難関私立大 英語 ＜読解編＞

この講座は，いよいよ迫る本番の入試に備えて，志望校の過去問を通じて，実践力をつけていく構成となっています。本番を想定して，**20 ～ 30 分と時間を決めて，問題を解いてみてください。**本テキストの全ての問題が，**関西大学，関西学院大学，同志社大学，立命館大学の過去問**を使用しています。

次に，**1 時間と決めて，予習にしっかりと取り組んでみてください。**わからない単語を辞書で調べて意味を書き込む。カッコやスラッシュを使って，文構造を意識して，一文一文の意味を考えてきてください。

この直前期でも，授業後に，**長文は必ず音読を十回やってもらいます。**例年第一志望に合格した生徒たちが口をそろえて言います。授業後の音読十回のおかげで，本当に英語長文がすらすら読めるようになりましたと。それから，本テキストにある全ての単語を必ず覚えることもとても大切な復習となります。

地道な作業の積み重ねこそが，大事を成す唯一の手段であること。そして，授業を聞くだけの受動的な姿勢ではなく，**予習，復習を自らする能動的な姿勢こそが，大事を成す基本**であることは，この時期でも何ら変わらないので，お忘れなく。

肘井　学

目　次

第１講　英語長文演習①　p2
第２講　英語長文演習②　p10
第３講　英語長文演習③　p18
第４講　英語長文演習④　p28

第１講 英語長文演習①

1 次の英文の下線部について，後の設問に対する答えとして最も適当なものをそれぞれＡ～Ｃから一つずつ選びなさい。

You are on your way to a concert. At an intersection, you encounter a group of people, all staring at the sky. Without even thinking about it, you look upwards, too. Why? *Social proof*. In the middle of the concert, when the soloist is giving an excellent performance, someone begins to clap and suddenly the whole room joins in. You do, too. Why? *Social proof*. After the concert you go to the coat check to pick up your coat. You watch how the people in front of you place a coin on a plate, even though, officially, the service is included in the ticket price. What do you do? You probably leave a coin as well. Why? *Social proof*.

Social proof, sometimes roughly termed the herd instinct, dictates that individuals feel they are behaving correctly when they act the same as other people. In other words, if a large number of people follow a certain idea, others will find this idea truer or better. And ① <u>the more people who display a certain behavior, the more appropriate others will judge it</u>. This is, of course, ridiculous. Social proof is the evil behind economic bubbles and stock market panic. It exists in fashion, management techniques, hobbies, religion and diets. In some cases, it can even negatively affect whole cultures.

NOTE

A simple experiment carried out in the 1950s by legendary psychologist Solomon Asch shows how common sense is influenced by peer pressure, the tendency to want to act the same as the members of one's social group. In Asch's experiment, a research participant is shown a line drawn on paper, and next to it three lines — numbered 1, 2 and 3 — one shorter, one longer and one of the same length as the original one. The participant must indicate which of the three lines ② corresponds to the original one. If that participant is alone in the room, he gives correct answers — unsurprising, because the task is really quite simple. Now five other people enter the room; they are all actors, a fact that the participant does not know. One after another, they give wrong answers, saying "number 1," although it's very clear that number 3 is the correct answer. Then it is the participant's turn again. In one third of cases, ③ he will answer incorrectly to match the other people's responses.

Why do we act like this? In the past, following others was a good survival strategy. Suppose that 50,000 years ago, you were travelling in the wild with your hunter-gatherer friends, and suddenly they all fled at the sight of an animal. What would you have done? Would you have remained still, wondering about what you were looking at? Was it a lion, or something that just looked like a lion but was in fact a harmless animal? No, you would have followed your friends. Later on, when you were safe, you could have reflected on what the "lion" had actually been. Those who acted differently from the group ④ did not pass their genes on to the later generations.

NOTE

We are directly descended from those who copied the others’ behavior. This pattern is so deeply rooted in us that we still use it today, even when it offers no survival advantage, which is most of the time. ⑤Only a few cases come to mind where social proof is of value. For example, if you find yourself hungry in a foreign city and don’t know a good restaurant, it makes sense to pick the one that’s full of local people. In other words, you copy the local people’s behavior.

[The Art of Thinking Clearly by Rolf Dobelli, Hodder and Stoughton Limited, 2013, Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.]

NOTE

NOTE

（1）下線部①から読み取れるものはどれか。

A. People tend to praise others.

B. People tend to imitate others.

C. People tend to ignore others.

（2）下線部②の意味に最も近いものはどれか。

A. is equal to　　B. is transformed by　　C. is apart from

（3）下線部③が意味するものはどれか。

A. he will be unable to give the same answers as the other people did

B. he will give the wrong answer because the other people did

C. he will struggle with the same questions the others struggled with

（4）下線部④が意味するものはどれか。

A. did not tell their children about it

B. did not give information about their children

C. did not survive and have children

（5）下線部⑤の意味に最も近いものはどれか。

A. One can only think of a few examples of social proof being useful.

B. People seldom care whether or not social proof is useful.

C. There are only a few locations where social proof is useful.

2 本文の内容に照らして最も適当なものをそれぞれ A ～ C から一つずつ選びなさい。

（1）The author used the first paragraph to show

A. that social proof is often seen at concerts.

B. what kind of behavior is considered to be social proof.

C. how following the rules of social proof makes people good citizens.

（2）The second paragraph, starting “Social proof, sometimes,” makes the point that

A. people have no choice but to follow an idea if many others do.

B. an idea is probably better if more people believe it is.

C. social proof may have a negative effect on people and society.

（3）According to the third paragraph, starting “A simple experiment,” research has shown that people

A. sometimes change their answers in order to agree with others.

B. find it harder to answer problems correctly when they are alone.

C. in groups deliberately enjoy giving wrong answers to researchers.

（4）According to the fourth paragraph, starting “Why do we,” the habit of following the behavior of other people

A. started because of the danger of living near lions.

B. has been a human characteristic for a long time.

C. has no useful purpose in the world we live in.

第２講 英語長文演習②

次の英文を読んで，問に答えなさい。

The debate over how technology influences jobs is as old as the industrial era itself. In the second decade of the nineteenth century, a group of English textile workers protested the introduction of *spinning frames and *power looms, machines of the early Industrial Revolution that threatened to leave them without jobs. Since then, each new burst of technological progress has brought another wave of concern about a possible mass（　1　）of human labor.

On one side of the debate are those who believe that new technologies are（　2　）to replace workers. In 1930, after the spread of electricity and the motor car engine, one economist predicted that (3) <u>such innovations would lead to an increase in material prosperity but also to widespread unemployment</u>. At the beginning of the computer era, in 1964, a group of scientists and social theorists warned that automation results in improving the productive capacity, requiring progressively less human labor. On the other side are those who say that workers will be just fine. They point out that real wages and the number of jobs, have increased relatively steadily throughout the industrialized world even as technology has advanced like never before.

NOTE

In 1983, the Nobel Prize-winning economist Wassily Leontief highlighted the debate through a clever comparison of humans and horses. For many decades, horse labor appeared unaffected by technological change. Even as railroads replaced the stagecoach and the *Conestoga wagon, the U.S. horse population grew seemingly without end. The animals were（　4　）not only on farms but also in the country’s rapidly growing urban centers. But then, with the introduction and spread of the powerful and efficient engine, the trend was rapidly reversed. As engines found their way into automobiles in the city and tractors in the countryside, horses became largely（　5　）. Then, the question is whether a similar outcome is possible for human labor. Are autonomous machines and supercomputers indicating a coming wave of technological progress that will finally sweep humans out of the economy? For Leontief, the answer was yes. However, he missed a number of important points. Humans, fortunately, are not horses and remain an important part of the economy.

NOTE

Alfred Marshall, a British economist, in his foundational 1890 book, *Principles of Economics,* said, "Human wants and desires are countless in number and very various in kind." Ever since Marshall, people have linked unlimited wants to full employment. After all, who else (　6　) workers will be able to fulfill all those wants and desires? We humans are a deeply social species, and the desire for human connections carries over to our economic lives. We come together to appreciate human expression ability when we attend plays and sporting events. Regular customers often visit particular restaurant not only because of the food and drink, but because of the hospitality offered. (7) <u>In these cases, human interaction is central to the economic transaction, not incidental to it.</u> Humans have economic wants that can be satisfied only by other humans, and that makes us deny that we will go the way of the horse.

*spinning frames：紡績機　　　**power looms：動力織機

***Conestoga wagon：大型幌馬車

［Republished with permission of the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc. from 'Will Humans Go the Way of Horses?' by Erik Brynjolfsson and Andrew McAfee, FOREIGN AFFAIRS, (July/August 2015). permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.］

A. 本文中の空所（1, 2, 4, 5, 6）に入れるのに最も適当なものを, それぞれ下記（a ～ d）の中から一つ選びなさい。

（1）a. production　b. invitation　c. assessment　d. displacement

（2）a. likely　b. anxious　c. reluctant　d. stunned

（4）a. external　b. reflective　c. ethical　d. vital

（5）a. adaptive　b. irrelevant　c. familiar　d. destructive

（6）a. of　b. in　c. but　d. for

B. 下線部（3),（7）を，それぞれ such innovations と these cases を具体的に説明して，日本語に訳しなさい。

C. 次の英文（a ～ f）の中から本文の内容と一致するものを二つ選びなさい。

a. Textile workers in the industrial era were quite satisfied with the new machines, although they complained of the burden imposed on their daily work.

b. There are more people who found the negative effects of new technologies on human labor than those who did not.

c. Those who are not worried about technological advancement think that workers will not suffer from innovations.

d. The number of horses seen in the city and countryside had been decreasing even before the introduction of the automobile.

e. Leontief thought that humans would not be replaced by the wave of technological advancement.

f. Human labor is essential for the economy because people depend on interaction with each other in their economic lives.

NOTE

第３講　英語長文演習③

次の英文を読んで，問に答えなさい。

Candy is celebratory. Almost every culture celebrates with sweets, but in the United States, candy and its holiday packaging is central in the celebration of holidays such as Easter, Halloween, Valentine's Day, Christmas, and New Year's; a box of chocolates is often considered the perfect gift for (a)the person who is "hard to buy for". Candy is also big business. Much of the candy industry's total sales of around $28 billion per year are sold around the holidays. According to the National Confectioner Association*, of the $92.91 spent on candy per person in the United States, $20.39 is spent on Halloween candy（　ア　）.

All of this celebrating results（　イ　）a punishing amount of material being sent into the waste stream. Waste and Resources Action Program (WRAP), the United Kingdom's waste management program, estimates that 3,000 tons of waste are generated by the packaging of Easter candy bought in the United Kingdom. In 2009, WRAP worked with confectionary manufacturers, who then significantly reduced the environmental impact of their Easter products.

Not all of candy's packaging is based on marketing strategy; much of it is driven by science. A candy dish is still seen as a form of hospitality,（　ウ　）it is sitting on a grandmother's coffee table or on a hostess counter at a restaurant. Historically, people would simply reach in with fingers to grab a few unwrapped candies, but people now want after-dinner mints to be individually wrapped so that they are germ-free. Keeping germs out of foodstuffs requires packaging.

NOTE

Some design is（ V ）with keeping candy（ ロ ）breaking; people want to open candy and find it intact to have the pleasure of breaking it, dividing it up, unraveling* or stretching it into bite-size pieces. Keeping candy intact during shipping and storing requires packaging.（中略）

According to an Environmental Protection Agency 2008 report, containers and packaging generate 30.8 percent of municipal solid waste, representing the largest portion of the total amount. Food scraps made up 12.7 percent of the total municipal solid waste that year, but candy is really not a major offender in this category. Candy is not highly perishable, and for most people, candy is a prized food, meaning the candy is（ W ）to be consumed.（ X ）, most candy packaging ends up in landfills. It is also present as litter: on the street, in waterways, and along roads. The packaging consists（ ハ ）some paper, aluminum foil, and plastic. The mixed polymers that compose the plastic film used in candy packing do not lend it to recycling; it can be incinerated*, but most of this waste（ Y ）finds its way into a landfill.

Bulk candy, some of which is not individually wrapped, is sold in some venues, and is the best choice for anyone（ V ）about unnecessary packaging entering the waste stream. As in other product categories, there has been some effort to use biodegradable* packaging, and there is a small industry that uses recycled juice bags and some brands of candy wrappers to create tote bags, jewelry, and other accessories. But (b) these efforts are small in proportion to the problem.

NOTE

Maybe the worst offenders are products that are both candy and toys, such as lollipops* that have flashing lights, lollipops attached to a battery-powered motor that（　あ　）them spin, and plastic covers that（　い　）them（　う　）（　え　）microphones.

Although it seems a large part of candy marketing is aimed at children, it may be more correct to say it is directed at childhood. Adults buy candy for children (c) as a means of vicarious pleasure, remembering how much candy meant to them as children. Part of the pleasure of candy is nostalgia, not just of the candy itself, but also of the packaging. One development in the candy industry is marketing of nostalgia candy; consumers want the candy of their childhood, and this demand is（　Z　）met primarily through Internet sales. The home delivery of products has some increased impact on the waste stream if consumers do not make the effort to recycle the cardboard boxes, plastic bags, and the other packaging required to get the product to them intact.

*National Confectioner Association　全米菓子製造者組合

*unraveling　ほぐす　　　*incinerated　incinerate（焼却する）の過去分詞

*biodegradable　微生物によって分解される　　　*lollipops ロリポップ（棒つきアメ）

［Republished with permission of SAGE Publications, Inc, from Encyclopedia of consumption and waste, Carl A. Zimring and William L. Rathje, 2012, permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.］

NOTE

Ⅰ-A 空所（T)～(Z）に入る最も適切なものを次の１～４の中からそれぞれ一つ選びなさい。ただし，（V）は本文中に二カ所あり，同じ単語が入ります。

(T) 1 alone	2 even	3 ever	4 together
(U) 1 however	2 where	3 whereas	4 whether
(V) 1 associated	2 charged	3 concerned	4 worried
(W) 1 about	2 likely	3 never	4 used
(X) 1 Besides	2 However	3 Otherwise	4 Similarly
(Y) 1 eventually	2 hardly	3 officially	4 willingly
(Z) 1 been	2 being	3 have	4 having

Ⅰ-B 空所（イ)～(ハ）に入る最も適切なものを次の１～４の中からそれぞれ一つ選びなさい。同じ語を二度使ってはいけません。選択肢の中には使われないものが一つ含まれています。

1 for　　2 from　　3 in　　4 of

Ⅰ-C 波線部（a)～(c）の意味・内容を最も的確に示すものを次の１～４の中からそれぞれ一つ選びなさい。

(a) the person who is "hard to buy for"

1 someone for whom a gift is very meaningful

2 someone for whom it is difficult to choose a gift

3 someone who cannot afford to buy any gift

4 someone who hardly accepts any gift

(b) these efforts are small in proportion to the problem

1 only small efforts are necessary to solve the problem

2 small efforts are sufficient to solve the problem

3 the problem has little connection with these efforts

4 the problem is too big for these efforts to be really effective

(c) as a means of vicarious pleasure

1 in order that adults get satisfaction from eating candy only by themselves

2 in order that adults teach children how to buy candy

3 so as to let children enjoy candy on adults' behalf

4 so as to show how the meaning of candy has changed

Ⅰ-D　二重下線部の空所 (あ)～(え) に次の 1 ～ 6 の語を入れて文を完成させたとき，(あ)～(え) に入る語の番号を記入しなさい。同じ語を二度使ってはいけません。選択肢の中には使われないものが二つ含まれています。

such as lollipops that have flashing lights, lollipops attached to a battery-powered motor that (　あ　) them spin, and plastic covers that (　い　) them (　う　) (　え　) microphones

1 like　　2 likes　　3 look　　4 looks　　5 make　　6 makes

Ⅰ-E 本文の意味・内容に合致するものを次の１～８の中から三つ選びなさい。

1 Candy is celebratory in almost every culture, but the United States is a rare exception.

2 Of the annual candy sales in the United States, about two-thirds are spent on Halloween candy.

3 In the United Kingdom, 3,000 tons of Easter candy is wasted every year.

4 In the past, people preferred wrapped candies as a form of hospitality.

5 Packaging is necessary to keep candies untouched and undamaged while they are shipped and stored.

6 According to the 2008 report, the containers and packaging of candy formed the biggest part of municipal solid waste, which made up 30.8%.

7 Candy itself does not contribute much to food scraps, because it is rarely thrown away.

8 Nostalgia candy is a growing market, in which the packaging as well as the candy itself matters.

Ⅰ-F 本文中の下線部を日本語に訳しなさい。

NOTE

第４講 英語長文演習④

次の英文を読んで，問に答えなさい。

Every parent knows that toddlers are strange creatures. They are changeable and contradictory, particularly when trying to interact with other people. My two-year-old daughter is no exception. One moment she is worrying about a crying baby. The next, she is taking away her friend's toy and shouting, "Mine!" When I tell her not to do something, she doesn't listen to me. Yet a new study from the University of Cambridge suggests that what I say to her today could shape her ability to reason about other people's minds for years to come.

For decades, scientists believed that *theory of mind* — the ability to reason about other people's thoughts and emotions — doesn't begin to mature until children reach the age of three or four. They came up with this age using a test called the false-belief task. The test examines whether a child can take the perspective of someone else. In one classic example, children are presented with the following story: Sally is playing with a ball. She puts it in a basket and leaves. While she's gone, Anne moves the ball from the basket to a box. The child is then asked, "When Sally returns, where will she look for the ball?"

Most two- and three-year-olds answer that Sally would look in the box because that's where they know the ball is. But by four or five, children typically say that Sally would look in the basket because that's where *she would think* the ball is. It is a simple switch from an answer based on concrete facts to one based on presumptions about someone else's knowledge or beliefs. Yet this modest development in social reasoning allows us to survive in a well-connected, social world.

NOTE

While children’s performance on the false-belief task initially led scientists to conclude that *theory of mind* develops around age three or four, that assumption has since been overturned. Beginning in 2005, a series of clever studies using a modified version of the false-belief task found evidence of this reasoning ability in toddlers and even infants as young as ten months of age.

While children typically master the standard false-belief task around the age of four, the timing can range from three to nearly six years of age, depending on the child. Parent-child interactions seem to influence the timing of this milestone in individual children. Studies have shown that children tend to perform better on false-belief tasks when their mothers refer more often to mental states with them in conversations. Typical topics include other people's thoughts, emotions, or desires. However, the positive effect of these conversations is sometimes seen only a few years later. But is this effect just a matter of learning a few key words a little sooner or can it lead to long-lasting differences in *theory of mind*?

Rosie Ensor, Claire Hughes, and their colleagues at the University of Cambridge tackled this question by testing children over the course of eight years. They first visited the homes of two-year-olds during a family meal and recorded how often the mother and child used ‘thought words’ such as know, forget, understand. Further tests were given over several years. Finally, the authors studied the correlations between the resulting measures and created models to show their relationships to one another. The scientists published their results in a 2014 issue of the journal *Child Development*. They found that the more mothers used ‘thought words’ with their two-year-olds, the better the children performed on tests, like the false-belief task, at six years of age.

NOTE

Will talking to a two-year-old about others' thoughts and beliefs make a child better at social reasoning in the future? It's hard to say. These latest results are based on correlations and there is no proof that one thing causes another. Therefore, nobody can say for certain that talking to two-year-olds about others' thoughts and beliefs will make them better at social reasoning. Still, these results are curious and suggestive. Encouraging young children to think about others' beliefs and feelings may strengthen social reasoning or simply get children into the habit of considering others' thoughts in ways that persist into their middle-school years.

For now, it's clear that a toddler's understanding of other people's minds is complex and evolving. I see it every day in the actions of my daughter. But maybe, by talking about thoughts and beliefs with her today, I can prepare her and give her the tools she'll need to find her way tomorrow.

[The Benefits of Talking about Thoughts with Tots by Rebecca Schwarzlose, January 28, 2014. Reproduced with permission. Copyright © 2014 SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, a Division of Nature America, Inc. All rights reserved.]

NOTE

〔1〕 本文の意味，内容にかかわる問い（A)～(D)，それぞれの答えとして，本文に従って最も適当なものを（1)～(4）から一つ選びなさい。

(A) According to the author, why do parents think that toddlers are strange creatures?

(1) Because they are creatures of habit.

(2) Because they won’t listen to parents.

(3) Because they are not easily predictable.

(4) Because they often end up becoming upset

(B) What does the false-belief task help scientists measure?

(1) Children’s physical movements.

(2) Children’s thought patterns while playing.

(3) Children’s fondness for playing with others.

(4) Children’s ability to grasp another’s viewpoint

(C) How have scientists’ beliefs about *theory of mind* changed in the last decade?

(1) They now believe that it helps people survive in society.

(2) They now know that mastery of it starts when a baby is born.

(3) They now recognize that it can be found even in ten-month-old babies.

(4) They now think that it develops much later than they previously assumed.

（D）What did the study by Ensor, Hughes, and their colleagues show about the development of children’s thoughts?

（1）Frequently doing false-belief tasks leads to worse social reasoning in children.

（2）Frequent use of thought words' by mothers may increase children's social reasoning.

（3）Frequent visitors to a child’s house are probably necessary for improving their social reasoning.

（4）Frequent encounters between children build trust and may lead to them being better at social reasoning.

〔2〕次の（1)～(5）の文の中で，本文の内容と一致するものには 1 の番号を，一致しないものには 2 の番号を，まだ本文の内容からだけではどちらとも判断しかねるものには 3 の番号を書きなさい。

（1）Prior to 2005, scientists believed that the ability to understand others' thoughts begins from age three or four.

（2）In the false-belief task, the majority of two- and three-year-olds answered that Sally would look for the ball in the basket.

（3）The false-belief task was first used with adults.

（4）The team from the University of Cambridge published their results in the journal *Child Development*.

（5）According to the author, encouraging toddlers to think of another’s thoughts or feelings will lead to better academic achievement.

〔3〕本文の内容を最もよく表しているものを（1）～（5）から一つ選びなさい。

（1）The development of thoughts

（2）The results from the false-belief tasks on children

（3）The controversy of using 'thought words' with children

（4）The effective comprehension of 'thought words' through reading tests

（5）*Theory of mind* and the development of social reasoning in young children

第１講　　解答

＜解答＞

1 （1）B　（2）A　（3）B　（4）C　（5）A

2 （1）B　（2）C　（3）A　（4）B

＜全訳＞

あなたはコンサートに行く途中だ。交差点で，偶然人々の集団に出会うが，彼らはみんな空をじっと見ている。それについて考えることすらせずに，あなたも上を見上げる。なぜか。「社会的証明」だ。コンサートの途中で，ソリストが素晴らしい演奏をしていると，誰かが拍手をし始めて，突然その部屋全体が拍手をし始める。あなたも拍手をする。なぜか。「社会的証明」だ。コンサートの後で, 手荷物預かり所に行き，コートを受け取る。公式には，そのサービスはチケット代に含まれているのだが，自分の前の人がプレートにコインを置いている様子をあなたは見る。あなたはどうするか。おそらく同じようにコインを置いていく。なぜか。「社会的証明」だ。

社会的証明は，ときに大ざっぱに群本能と呼ばれるが，個人が他人と同じ行動をとると，正しく行動していると感じるように仕向ける。すなわち，もし大多数の人がある考えに従うなら，他の人もこの考えをより正しいとかより良いと思うだろう。そして，ある行動を示す人がより多ければ多いほど，それだけ他の人はそれを適切だと思うだろう。もちろんこれは，ばかげたことだ。社会的証明は，バブル経済や株式市場の混乱の背後にある悪だ。それは流行や，経営技術，趣味，宗教，食べ物にもある。ある場合には，それは文化全体にマイナスの影響すら与えることがある。

伝説的な心理学者のソロモン・アッシュが 1950 年代に行った単純な実験では，常識が仲間の圧力，すなわちその人の社会集団の構成員と同じ行動をとることを望む傾向によってどう影響を受けるかが示されている。アッシュの実験では，研究の参加者は，紙に描かれた一本の線と，その隣にある 1，2，3 の番号が振られた三本の線を見せられるが，一つは短いもの，もう一つは長いもの，そして最後は最初の一本の線と同じ長さのものである。参加者は，その三本の線のどれが最初の線と同じかを示さなければならない。もしその参加者が部屋に一人でいるなら，彼は正しい答えを出すが，その仕事が本当にきわめて単純なので，これは驚きではない。今度は，五人のほかの人が部屋の中に入る。その人たちはみな俳優で，参加者はその事実を知らない。次から次へとその人たちは「1 番」を示して，間違った答えを言うが，3 番が正解なのは

非常に明らかなのだ。そして，再び参加者の順番だ。3 分の 1 の割合で，彼は間違った解答を言って，他の人の反応に合わせるだろう。

　なぜ私たちはこのように行動するのか。その昔，他人に従うことが生存するための賢い方法だった。50,000 年前に狩猟採集民の仲間と荒野を移動していて，突然動物を見ると仲間全員が逃げ出したと想像してみなさい。あなたはどうするだろうか。あなたはじっとしたまま，自分が見ているものについて思いを巡らすだろうか。それはライオンか，あるいは単にライオンのように見えて実は害のない動物なのだろうかと。いいえ，あなたは仲間の後についていくだろう。後になって，自分が安全なら，「ライオン」が実際には何であったかを熟考するだろう。集団と違った行動をした人は，自分の遺伝子を次の世代に伝えられなかった。私たちは他人の行動を模倣していた人たちの直系の子孫だ。このパターンは私達にとても深く根付いているので，多くの場合生存上何らの優利な点をもたらさないのだが，そんな時でさえ，いまだに今日でも，それを利用する。社会的証明が価値のある場合など，ごくわずかしか思い浮かばない。例えば, 海外の都市で, 気付いたらお腹が空いており, 良いレストランを知らないなら, 地元の人でいっぱいのレストランを選ぶのは理にかなっている。すなわち，地元の人間の行動をまねるのだ。

第１講 重要語彙リスト ＊一つ一つ何度も繰り返して，覚えてください

1	intersection	交差点
2	encounter	偶然出会う
3	stare at	じっと見つめる
4	performance	演奏
5	clap	手を叩く
6	roughly	大ざっぱに
7	herd	群衆
8	instinct	本能
9	dictate	要求する
10	correctly	正しく
11	display	示す
12	appropriate	適切な
13	ridiculous	ばかげた
14	evil	悪
15	legendary	伝説的な
16	common sense	常識
17	peer	仲間
18	correspond to	〜に一致する
19	one after another	次から次へと
20	strategy	戦略
21	suppose	仮定する
22	flee	逃げる
23	at the sight of	〜を見て
24	still	静止して
25	reflect on	熟考する
26	pass A on to B	A を B に伝える
27	gene	遺伝子
28	be descended from	〜の子孫だ
29	of value	価値のある
30	make sense	理にかなっている

第１講 音読用白文 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩

You are on your way to a concert. At an intersection, you encounter a group of people, all staring at the sky. Without even thinking about it, you look upwards, too. Why? *Social proof*. In the middle of the concert, when the soloist is giving an excellent performance, someone begins to clap and suddenly the whole room joins in. You do, too. Why? *Social proof*. After the concert you go to the coat check to pick up your coat. You watch how the people in front of you place a coin on a plate, even though, officially, the service is included in the ticket price. What do you do? You probably leave a coin as well. Why? *Social proof.*

Social proof, sometimes roughly termed the herd instinct, dictates that individuals feel they are behaving correctly when they act the same as other people. In other words, if a large number of people follow a certain idea, others will find this idea truer or better. And the more people who display a certain behavior, the more appropriate others will judge it. This is, of course, ridiculous. Social proof is the evil behind economic bubbles and stock market panic. It exists in fashion, management techniques, hobbies, religion and diets. In some cases, it can even negatively affect whole cultures.

A simple experiment carried out in the 1950s by legendary psychologist Solomon Asch shows how common sense is influenced by peer pressure, the tendency to want to act the same as the members of one’s social group. In Asch’s experiment, a research participant is shown a line drawn on paper, and next to it three lines — numbered 1, 2 and 3 — one shorter, one longer and one of the same length as the original one. The participant must indicate which of the three lines corresponds to the original one. If that participant is alone in the room, he gives correct answers — unsurprising, because the task is really quite simple. Now five other people enter the room; they are all actors, a fact that the participant does not know. One after another, they give wrong answers, saying “number 1,” although it’s very clear that number 3 is the correct answer. Then it is the participant’s turn again. In one third of cases, he will answer incorrectly to match the other people’s responses.

Why do we act like this? In the past, following others was a good survival

strategy. Suppose that 50,000 years ago, you were travelling in the wild with your hunter-gatherer friends, and suddenly they all fled at the sight of an animal. What would you have done? Would you have remained still, wondering about what you were looking at? Was it a lion, or something that just looked like a lion but was in fact a harmless animal? No, you would have followed your friends. Later on, when you were safe, you could have reflected on what the “lion” had actually been. Those who acted differently from the group did not pass their genes on to the later generations. We are directly descended from those who copied the others’ behavior. This pattern is so deeply rooted in us that we still use it today, even when it offers no survival advantage, which is most of the time. Only a few cases come to mind where social proof is of value. For example, if you find yourself hungry in a foreign city and don’t know a good restaurant, it makes sense to pick the one that’s full of local people. In other words, you copy the local people’s behavior.

第２講 解答

＜解答＞

A.（1）d （2）a （4）d （5）b （6）c

B.（3）電気や自動車のエンジンが広まったおかげで，物質的な豊かさは増すだろうが，失業も広がるだろう。

（7）なじみの客が特定のレストランを訪ねる理由が，そこで提供されるおもてなしであるような場合，人間同士の交流は，経済取引に対して付随的なものではなくて，その中心となる。

C. c, f

＜全訳＞

科学技術がどのように仕事に影響を与えているかに関する議論は，工業時代そのものと同じくらい古いものだ。1810 年代に，イギリスの織物工の集団が，紡績機や動力織機の導入に抗議をした，それらは彼らの仕事を奪う恐れがある産業革命初期の機械だった。その時からずっと，技術革新の新しい突然の出現があるごとに，人間の労働が大量に取って代わられる可能性に関する心配というもう一つの波を引き起こしてきた。

その議論の一方には，新しい技術が労働者に取って代わる可能性があると信じる人がいる。1930 年には，電気や自動車エンジンが広まったのを受けて，一人の経済学者が，そのような革新によって，物質的豊かさが増すだろうが，失業も広がるだろうと予言した。コンピューター時代の幕開けである 1964 年に，科学者や社会理論家の集団が，自動化が原因で，生産能力が上がり，次第に人間の労働が不要となるだろうと警告した。他方には，労働者は問題ないと言う人々がいる。その人たちが指摘するには，科学技術がかつてないほど進歩している時でさえ，実際の賃金や仕事の数は，産業界を通じて，比較的着実に増えているということだ。

1983 年に，ノーベル賞を受賞した経済学者のワシリー・レオンチェフは，人間と馬を巧みに比較して，その議論を浮かび上がらせた。何十年もの間，馬の労働は技術の変化に影響を受けなかったように思われた。鉄道が駅馬車や大型幌馬車に取って代わった時でさえ，アメリカの馬の数は，見たところ果てしなく増えていった。その動物は，農場だけでなく，その国の急速に成長していた都心部でも重要であった。しかしそれから，強力かつ効率のよいエンジンの導入と広まりによって，その傾向は急速

に逆転した。エンジンが，都市部の自動車や，田舎のトラクターに行き着くと，馬は大部分が無意味なものになっていった。そこで，問題は同様の結果が人間の労働に起こりうるかどうかである。自律した機械やスーパーコンピューターは，最終的に人間を経済から一掃する将来の技術的進歩の波を示しているのだろうか。レオンチェフにとっては，答えは Yes であった。しかしながら，彼はいくつかの重要な点を見逃していた。人間は, 幸いなことに, 馬ではないし, 経済の重要な一部のままでい続けている。

アルフレッド・マーシャルというイギリスの経済学者は，彼の基盤となる 1890 年の本『経済学原理』の中で，「人間の欲求や欲望は無数にあり，種類も非常に多様だ」と言っている。マーシャル以来ずっと，人々は無限の欲望を完全雇用に結び付けてきた。結局，労働者以外誰が，それら全ての欲求や欲望を満たすことができるだろうか。私たち人間は，徹底的に社会的な種で，人間的つながりへの欲求が，経済生活に及ぶ。遊びやスポーツイベントに参加するとき，団結して人間の表現能力を正しく認める。なじみの客が頻繁に特定のレストランを訪ねるのは，食事や飲み物が目当てであるだけでなく，そこで提供されるおもてなしが理由でもある。この場合には，人間同士の交流は，経済取引の中心であって，付随的なものではない。人間には他の人間によってのみ満たせる経済的欲求があり，そのおかげで，私たちは馬がたどった道を進むことを否定できるのだ。

第２講　重要語彙リスト　　＊一つ一つ何度も繰り返して，覚えてください

1	debate	議論
2	era	時代
3	protest	抗議する
4	introduction	導入
5	threaten to do	～する恐れがある
6	burst	爆発，突発
7	concern	心配
8	mass	大量
9	replace	取って代わる
10	spread	広まり
11	predict	予言する
12	innovation	革新
13	prosperity	繁栄
14	widespread	広範囲の
15	result in	～に終わる
16	progressively	次第に，ますます
17	wage	賃金
18	steadily	着実に
19	highlight	強調する，目立たせる
20	comparison	比較
21	railroad	鉄道
22	seemingly	見たところ
23	urban	都会の
24	trend	傾向
25	reverse	逆転する
26	find one’s way into	～に行き着く
27	countryside	田舎
28	outcome	結果
29	autonomous	自律的な
30	indicate	示す
31	sweep	一掃する
32	fortunately	幸いなことに
33	countless	無数だ
34	link A to B	A を B に結び付ける
35	fulfill	満たす
36	carry over to	～に引き継がれる，及ぶ
37	hospitality	もてなし
38	interaction	交流，相互作用
39	transaction	取引
40	incidental	付随する

第２講 音読用白文 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩

The debate over how technology influences jobs is as old as the industrial era itself. In the second decade of the nineteenth century, a group of English textile workers protested the introduction of spinning frames and power looms, machines of the early Industrial Revolution that threatened to leave them without jobs. Since then, each new burst of technological progress has brought another wave of concern about a possible mass displacement of human labor.

On one side of the debate are those who believe that new technologies are likely to replace workers. In 1930, after the spread of electricity and the motor car engine, one economist predicted that such innovations would lead to an increase in material prosperity but also to widespread unemployment. At the beginning of the computer era, in 1964, a group of scientists and social theorists warned that automation results in improving the productive capacity, requiring progressively less human labor. On the other side are those who say that workers will be just fine. They point out that real wages and the number of jobs, have increased relatively steadily throughout the industrialized world even as technology has advanced like never before.

In 1983, the Nobel Prize-winning economist Wassily Leontief highlighted the debate through a clever comparison of humans and horses. For many decades, horse labor appeared unaffected by technological change. Even as railroads replaced the stagecoach and the Conestoga wagon, the U.S. horse population grew seemingly without end. The animals were vital not only on farms but also in the country’s rapidly growing urban centers. But then, with the introduction and spread of the powerful and efficient engine, the trend was rapidly reversed. As engines found their way into automobiles in the city and tractors in the countryside, horses became largely irrelevant. Then, the question is whether a similar outcome is possible for human labor. Are autonomous machines and supercomputers indicating a coming wave of technological progress that will finally sweep humans out of the economy? For Leontief, the answer was yes. However, he missed a number of important points. Humans, fortunately, are not horses and remain an important part of

the economy.

Alfred Marshall, a British economist, in his foundational 1890 book, *Principles of Economics*, said, "Human wants and desires are countless in number and very various in kind." Ever since Marshall, people have linked unlimited wants to full employment. After all, who else but workers will be able to fulfill all those wants and desires? We humans are a deeply social species, and the desire for human connections carries over to our economic lives. We come together to appreciate human expression ability when we attend plays and sporting events. Regular customers often visit particular restaurant not only because of the food and drink, but because of the hospitality offered. In these cases, human interaction is central to the economic transaction, not incidental to it. Humans have economic wants that can be satisfied only by other humans, and that makes us deny that we will go the way of the horse.

第３講 解答

＜解答＞

Ⅰ-A (T) 1　(U) 4　(V) 3　(W) 2　(X) 2　(Y) 1　(Z) 2

Ⅰ-B (イ) 3　(ロ) 2　(ハ) 4

Ⅰ-C (a) 2　(b) 4　(c) 3

Ⅰ-D (あ) 6　(い) 5　(う) 3　(え) 1

Ⅰ-E 5, 7, 8

Ⅰ-F 全訳の下線部を参照。

＜全訳＞

キャンディは，お祝いに使用される。ほとんどどの文化でも甘いものでお祝いをするが，アメリカではキャンディとその祝日用の包装が，イースター，ハロウィーン，バレンタインデー，クリスマスや元旦のような祝日のお祝いの中心となる。チョコレートの箱は，贈り物をするのが難しい人に対する完璧な贈り物とみなされることがよくある。キャンディはまた大きなビジネスでもある。キャンディ産業全体の年間約 280 億ドルの売上の多くが，祝日前後の売り上げによるものだ。全米菓子製造者組合によると，アメリカで一人に付きキャンディに使われた 92.91 ドルの内，ハロウィーンのキャンディだけで 20.39 ドルが使われている。

こうしたお祝いの全ての結果，膨大な量の原材料が廃棄物の流れに送られてしまうことになる。廃棄物・資源行動計画（WRAP）というイギリスの廃棄物管理計画の見積もりでは，3000 トンの廃棄物がイギリスで購入されたイースターのキャンディの包みで産み出されているとのことだ。2009 年に, WRAP は菓子の製造会社に働きかけて，各社はイースターの商品の環境に与える影響をかなり減少させた。

キャンディの包装の全てがマーケティング戦略に基づいているわけではない。その多くが科学の力で動いている。キャンディの皿は，おばあちゃんの家の珈琲を飲むテーブルにあろうと，レストランの接客係のカウンターの上にあろうと，いまだに一種のおもてなしとみなされる。その昔，人は単に指を使って数個の包装されていないキャンディをつかもうと手を伸ばしたものだが，今では食後のミントが，ばい菌がつかないように，別々に包まれていることを望む。ばい菌がつかないように，食べ物は包装を必要としている。

包装のデザインの一部には，キャンディが割れないように配慮されているものもあ

る。キャンディを開き，それが無傷のままであって，一口サイズに折ったり，割ったり，ほぐしたり，引っぱったりして楽しみたいと人は思うのだ。運ぶ間や保存の間にキャンディに傷がつかないようにするには，包装が必要なのだ。（中略）

環境保護庁の 2008 年の報告によると，容器と包装紙が，市の固形廃棄物の 30.8% を生み出し，全体の中で最も大きい割合だった。食品ごみは，その年の市の固形廃棄物全体の 12.7% を占めていたが，キャンディはこの範疇では実際には主犯格ではない。キャンディはそんなに腐りやすいものではなく，ほとんどの人にとって，価値のある食べ物で，すなわちキャンディは消費されやすいものだ。しかし，ほとんどのキャンディの包装は，埋め立て地に行くことになる。それは，街頭や水路や道路沿いのゴミとしても存在している。その包み紙は，ある種の紙，アルミフォイル，そしてプラスチックから成る。キャンディの包装に使用される薄いプラスチック膜を構成する混合ポリマーは，リサイクルができない。焼却することはできるが，このゴミのほとんどが，最終的に埋め立て地に送られてしまう。

バルクキャンディは，中には個別に包装されていないものがあり，ある場所では売られていて，不要な包装が廃棄物になることを心配する人には最善の選択肢になる。他の商品のカテゴリーと同様，微生物によって分解される包装を使用する努力はなされており，リサイクルされたジュースのパックやあるブランドのキャンディの包みを利用して，トートバッグや宝石，他のアクセサリーを作る小さな業界がある。しかし，こういった努力は，その問題の大きさに対してはわずかなものでしかない。

おそらく最悪の犯人は，キャンディとおもちゃを兼ねる商品である。例えば，点滅灯付きロリポップや，回転させるバッテリー付きのモーターが付いているロリポップ，プラスチックのカバーが付いていてマイクのように見えるロリポップだ。

キャンディ市場の大部分は，子供をターゲットにしているように思えるが，子供時代に向けられているという方がより正確かもしれない。大人は，キャンディが子供のころの自分にとってどれほど大きな意味があったかを思い出して，他人を通じて自分の喜びを感じる手段として，子供にキャンディを買い与える。キャンディの喜びの一部は，単にキャンディそのものに対してだけではなく，包装に対する懐かしい思いからも来るのだ。キャンディ産業の一つの発展は，懐かしさを持つキャンディの市場だ。消費者は子供時代のキャンディを求めており，この需要に対しては，主にネット販売を通じて対応されている。商品の宅配は，商品を無傷で送り届けるのに必要な段ボール箱やビニール袋，そして他の包装をリサイクルする努力を消費者がしないなら，廃棄物の流れにさらに影響を与えてしまうのだ。

第３講 重要語彙リスト ＊一つ一つ何度も繰り返して，覚えてください

1	celebratory	お祝い用の
2	result in	～に終わる
3	punishing	つらい
4	waste	廃棄物
5	stream	流れ
6	estimate	見積もる
7	generate	産み出す
8	manufacturer	製造業者
9	significantly	かなり
10	impact	影響
11	strategy	戦略
12	a form of	一種の
13	hospitality	おもてなし
14	grab	つかむ
15	wrap	包む
16	germ	ばい菌
17	foodstuff	食料
18	keep O from ~ing	O に～させない
19	intact	無傷の
20	divide up	わける
21	stretch	伸ばす
22	container	容器
23	municipal	市営の
24	solid	固体の
25	represent	表す
26	portion	割合
27	major offender	主犯
28	category	範疇，カテゴリー
29	perishable	腐りやすい
30	end up ~	結局～になる
31	landfill	埋立地
32	consist of	～から成る
33	compose	構成する
34	venue	場所
35	in proportion to	～の割には
36	be attached to	～に取り付けられている
37	as a means of	～の手段として

第３講 音読用白文 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩

Candy is celebratory. Almost every culture celebrates with sweets, but in the United States, candy and its holiday packaging is central in the celebration of holidays such as Easter, Halloween, Valentine’s Day, Christmas, and New Year’s; a box of chocolates is often considered the perfect gift for the person who is “hard to buy for”. Candy is also big business. Much of the candy industry's total sales of around $28 billion per year are sold around the holidays. According to the National Confectioner Association, of the $92.91 spent on candy per person in the United States, $20.39 is spent on Halloween candy alone.

All of this celebrating results in a punishing amount of material being sent into the waste stream. Waste and Resources Action Program (WRAP), the United Kingdom's waste management program, estimates that 3,000 tons of waste are generated by the packaging of Easter candy bought in the United Kingdom. In 2009, WRAP worked with confectionary manufacturers, who then significantly reduced the environmental impact of their Easter products.

Not all of candy’s packaging is based on marketing strategy; much of it is driven by science. A candy dish is still seen as a form of hospitality, whether it is sitting on a grandmother's coffee table or on a hostess counter at a restaurant. Historically, people would simply reach in with fingers to grab a few unwrapped candies, but people now want after-dinner mints to be individually wrapped so that they are germ-free. Keeping germs out of foodstuffs requires packaging.

Some design is concerned with keeping candy from breaking; people want to open candy and find it intact to have the pleasure of breaking it, dividing it up, unraveling or stretching it into bite-size pieces. Keeping candy intact during shipping and storing requires packaging.

According to an Environmental Protection Agency 2008 report, containers and packaging generate 30.8 percent of municipal solid waste, representing the largest portion of the total amount. Food scraps made up 12.7 percent of the total municipal solid waste that year, but candy is really not a major offender in this category. Candy is not highly perishable, and for most people,

candy is a prized food, meaning the candy is likely to be consumed. However, most candy packaging ends up in landfills. It is also present as litter: on the street, in waterways, and along roads. The packaging consists of some paper, aluminum foil, and plastic. The mixed polymers that compose the plastic film used in candy packing do not lend it to recycling; it can be incinerated, but most of this waste eventually finds its way into a landfill.

Bulk candy, some of which is not individually wrapped, is sold in some venues, and is the best choice for anyone concerned about unnecessary packaging entering the waste stream. As in other product categories, there has been some effort to use biodegradable packaging, and there is a small industry that uses recycled juice bags and some brands of candy wrappers to create tote bags, jewelry, and other accessories. But these efforts are small in proportion to the problem.

Maybe the worst offenders are products that are both candy and toys, such as lollipops that have flashing lights, lollipops attached to a battery-powered motor that makes them spin, and plastic covers that make them look like microphones.

Although it seems a large part of candy marketing is aimed at children, it may be more correct to say it is directed at childhood. Adults buy candy for children as a means of vicarious pleasure, remembering how much candy meant to them as children. Part of the pleasure of candy is nostalgia, not just of the candy itself, but also of the packaging. One development in the candy industry is marketing of nostalgia candy; consumers want the candy of their childhood, and this demand is being met primarily through Internet sales. The home delivery of products has some increased impact on the waste stream if consumers do not make the effort to recycle the cardboard boxes, plastic bags, and the other packaging required to get the product to them intact.

第４講　解答

＜解答＞

〔1〕(A) 3　(B) 4　(C) 3　(D) 2

〔2〕(1) 1　(2) 2　(3) 3　(4) 1　(5) 3

〔3〕5

＜全訳＞

全ての親が幼児は変わった生き物だと知っている。幼児は，他人と交流しようとするときは特に，気まぐれで，矛盾している。私の 2 歳の娘も例外ではない。ある瞬間には，彼女は泣いている赤ん坊を心配しているが，次の瞬間には，彼女は友人のおもちゃを取り上げて，「私のだよ！」と叫んでいる。私が彼女に何かをしないように言っても，彼女は私の言うことを聞かない。しかし，ケンブリッジ大学の新しい研究の示すところによると，私が今日彼女に言うことによって，彼女が今後何年もの間他人の心を推測する能力を作り上げる可能性があるということだ。

何十年もの間，科学者は「心の理論」という他人の考えや感情を推測する力は，子供が 3 歳か 4 歳になるまで成熟しないと考えてきた。科学者は，誤信念課題と呼ばれるテストを使ってこの年齢を算出した。そのテストは，子供が他の人の視点で考えられるかどうかを調べるものだ。ある古典的な例に，子供が次のような話を聞かされるものがある。「サリーはボールを使って遊んでいる。彼女はそれをかごに入れて立ち去る。彼女がいない間に，アンはそのボールをかごから箱へと移す。」そして子供はこう尋ねられる。「サリーが戻ったら，彼女はボールを求めて，どこを探すだろうか。」

ほとんどの 2 歳児，3 歳児は，自分たちはボールがそこにあると知っているので，サリーは箱の中を見るだろうと答える。しかし, 4 歳や 5 歳までには, 子供はたいてい, サリーがそこにボールがあると思っているから，彼女はかごの中を見るだろうと言う。それは，具体的な事実に基づいた解答から，誰かの知識や考えに対する予測に基づいた解答への単純な切り替えだ。しかし，社会的推論におけるこのささやかな進歩のおかげで，私たちはしっかりとつながりのある社会的な世界で生きていけるのである。

誤信念課題に基づく子供たちのパフォーマンスによって，当初は科学者たちが「心の理論」は 3 歳か 4 歳ごろに発達すると結論を下していたけれども，その思い込みがその後ひっくり返されてきている。誤信念課題の修正版を使った一連の鋭い研究が 2005 年に始まり，よちよち歩きの幼児や生後 10 か月程度の幼児にさえこの推論能

力がある証拠を見つけた。

子供は，たいてい 4 歳頃に標準的な誤信念課題を習得するけれども，その時期は 3 歳からほぼ 6 歳までに及ぶ可能性があり，その子次第となる。親子のやりとりが，それぞれの子供のこの重大事が起きるタイミングに影響しているように思える。研究によってわかっているのは，母親が会話の中で子供と精神状態についてより多く話していると，誤信念課題をより上手に処理できる傾向にあるということだ。典型的な話題としては，他人の考え，感情，あるいは望んでいることなどがある。しかし，こういった会話が持つプラスの効果は，時に，数年たった後にしか見られないものもある。しかし，この影響は単にちょっと早くカギとなる語をいくつか学んでいるというだけの問題なのか，あるいはこの影響で「心の理論」に長期にわたる違いが生み出されるのだろうか。

ロジー・エンソル，クレア・ヒューズ，そして彼らのケンブリッジ大学の同僚は，8 年に渡って子供たちにテストをすることで，この問題に取り組んだ。彼らは最初に家族での食事の最中に 2 歳児の家庭を訪ねて，母親と子供が，知っている，忘れる，理解するといった「思考に関する言語」をどれほどの頻度で使用したかを記録した。さらなるテストが数年に渡って行われた。最終的に，その研究者たちは，結果生じる数量の間の相関関係を研究して，お互いに対する関係性を示すモデルを作り上げた。その科学者たちは，Child Development 誌の 2014 年号で結果を公表した。彼らは，母親が 2 歳児に「思考に関する言語」を多く使えば使うほど，それだけ子供たちの 6 歳時点での誤信念課題のような試験の成績は良くなった。

他人の思いや考えについて 2 歳児に話しかけることで，将来子供の社会的な推論能力はより高まるのだろうか。断言するのは難しい。これらの最新の結果は，相関関係に基づいており，ある物事がもう一つ別の物事の原因となっている証拠は何もない。したがって，他人の思いや考えについて 2 歳児と話すことで，彼らの社会的な推論能力がより高くなると，誰も確信を持っては言えない。それでも，これらの結果は意外であり，示唆に富んでいる。幼い子供を他人の考えや感情について考えるように促すことは，社会的な推論能力を高めるのかもしれないし，あるいは，単に子供に中学生になっても残る方法で，他人の考えを考慮する習慣を身に付けさせるものなのかもしれない。

現在明らかなのは，幼児が他人の心を理解することは複雑で，発展途上であるということだ。私は毎日娘の行動でそれを目にしている。しかし，多分今日彼女と思いや考えについて話をすることで，私は彼女に準備をさせて，明日自分のやり方を見つけるのに必要な道具を授けることはできる。

第４講 重要語彙リスト ＊一つ一つ何度も繰り返して，覚えてください

1	toddler	よちよち歩きの幼児
2	creature	生き物
3	contradictory	矛盾する
4	interact with	～と交流する
5	exception	例外
6	decade	十年
7	reason	推論する
8	mature	成熟する
9	come up with	～を思い付く
10	examine	調査する
11	perspective	見方
12	classic	古典的な
13	be presented with	～を提示される
14	concrete	具体的な
15	presumption	仮定
16	modest	控えめな
17	initially	最初に
18	conclude	結論を下す
19	assumption	思い込み
20	overturn	ひっくり返す
21	modify	修正する
22	infant	幼児
23	master	習得する
24	range	及ぶ
25	milestone	画期的事件
26	long-lasting	長く続く
27	over the course of	～の間
28	correlation	相関関係
29	measure	基準
30	relationship	関係
31	publish	公表する
32	issue	号
33	latest	最新の
34	proof	証拠
35	for certain	確実に
36	suggestive	示唆に富んでいる
37	strengthen	強くする
38	persist	存続する
39	complex	複雑な
40	evolving	発展途上の

第４講 音読用白文 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩

Every parent knows that toddlers are strange creatures. They are changeable and contradictory, particularly when trying to interact with other people. My two-year-old daughter is no exception. One moment she is worrying about a crying baby. The next, she is taking away her friend’s toy and shouting, “Mine!” When I tell her not to do something, she doesn’t listen to me. Yet a new study from the University of Cambridge suggests that what I say to her today could shape her ability to reason about other people’s minds for years to come.

For decades, scientists believed that *theory of mind* — the ability to reason about other people’s thoughts and emotions — doesn’t begin to mature until children reach the age of three or four. They came up with this age using a test called the false-belief task. The test examines whether a child can take the perspective of someone else. In one classic example, children are presented with the following story: Sally is playing with a ball. She puts it in a basket and leaves. While she’s gone, Anne moves the ball from the basket to a box. The child is then asked, “When Sally returns, where will she look for the ball?”

Most two- and three-year-olds answer that Sally would look in the box because that’s where they know the ball is. But by four or five, children typically say that Sally would look in the basket because that’s where she would think the ball is. It is a simple switch from an answer based on concrete facts to one based on presumptions about someone else’s knowledge or beliefs. Yet this modest development in social reasoning allows us to survive in a well-connected, social world.

While children’s performance on the false-belief task initially led scientists to conclude that *theory of mind* develops around age three or four, that assumption has since been overturned. Beginning in 2005, a series of clever studies using a modified version of the false-belief task found evidence of this reasoning ability in toddlers and even infants as young as ten months of age.

While children typically master the standard false-belief task around the

age of four, the timing can range from three to nearly six years of age, depending on the child. Parent-child interactions seem to influence the timing of this milestone in individual children. Studies have shown that children tend to perform better on false-belief tasks when their mothers refer more often to mental states with them in conversations. Typical topics include other people's thoughts, emotions, or desires. However, the positive effect of these conversations is sometimes seen only a few years later. But is this effect just a matter of learning a few key words a little sooner or can it lead to long-lasting differences in *theory of mind*?

Rosie Ensor, Claire Hughes, and their colleagues at the University of Cambridge tackled this question by testing children over the course of eight years. They first visited the homes of two-year-olds during a family meal and recorded how often the mother and child used 'thought words' such as know, forget, understand. Further tests were given over several years. Finally, the authors studied the correlations between the resulting measures and created models to show their relationships to one another. The scientists published their results in a 2014 issue of the journal *Child Development*. They found that the more mothers used 'thought words' with their two-year-olds, the better the children performed on tests, like the false-belief task, at six years of age.

Will talking to a two-year-old about others' thoughts and beliefs make a child better at social reasoning in the future? It's hard to say. These latest results are based on correlations and there is no proof that one thing causes another. Therefore, nobody can say for certain that talking to two-year-olds about others' thoughts and beliefs will make them better at social reasoning. Still, these results are curious and suggestive. Encouraging young children to think about others' beliefs and feelings may strengthen social reasoning or simply get children into the habit of considering others' thoughts in ways that persist into their middle-school years.

For now, it's clear that a toddler's understanding of other people's minds is complex and evolving. I see it every day in the actions of my daughter. But maybe, by talking about thoughts and beliefs with her today, I can prepare her and give her the tools she'll need to find her way tomorrow.

Ⓒ RECRUIT
本サービスに関する知的財産権その他一切の権利は著作権者に帰属します。
また本サービスに掲載の全部または一部につき無断複製・転載を禁止します。